

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 15 to 29 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Rejection of Claims 15 to 25, 28, and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15 to 25, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,359 (“Ueyanagi et al.”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,764 (“Susukida et al.”), U.S. Patent No. 6,387,778 (“Bonin et al.”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,919,713 (“Ishii et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 15, as presented, relates to a method for manufacturing a component, including, inter alia, forming the at least one connecting point as a setpoint rupture joint, and *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer*.

The proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 15, as presented. As admitted in the Office Action at page 4, Ueyanagi et al. do not expressly teach producing a circumferential trench that is interrupted by at least one connecting point. Since Ueyanagi et al. do not indicate at least one connecting point, Ueyanagi et al. also cannot indicate forming the at least one connecting point as a setpoint rupture point. Further, Ueyanagi et al. cannot indicate adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point, much less adjusting the mechanical stability via a thickness of the activatable layer. Thus, Ueyanagi et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the*

setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented.

Similarly, Susukida et al. do not indicate at least connecting point, and therefore cannot indicate forming the at least one connecting point as a setpoint rupture point, or adjusting the mechanical stability via a thickness of the activatable layer. Thus, since Susukida et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 15, as presented, Susukida et al. do not cure – and are not asserted to cure – the critical deficiencies of Ueyanagi et al.

Further, contrary to the Office’s assertions regarding claim 21 at page 9 of the Office Action, Bonin et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer*, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented. Bonin et al. merely indicate, in a plan view of the wafer, narrowing the periphery channel of a mask at the corners, in order to etch away less material at the corners 80. (Bonin et al., col. 4, lines 9 to 32; and Figures 7a and 7b). Thus, Bonin et al. merely indicate “adjusting the ratio of the main periphery width to the necked width at the corners” in order to adjust the mechanical stability of the tethers through subsequent etching. (Bonin et al., col. 4, lines 59 to 61). However, nowhere do Bonin et al. indicate changing the thickness of the activatable layer in order to adjust a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point. Thus, since Bonin et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer*, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented, Bonin et al. do not cure the critical deficiencies of Ueyanagi et al.

In addition, Ishii et al. do not indicate adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented. Thus, since Ishii et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 15, as presented, Ishii et al. do not cure – and are not asserted to cure – the critical deficiencies of Ueyanagi et al.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the foregoing reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15, as presented. Thus, as for claims 16 to 25, 28, and 29, which depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,296,741 (“Kim”). It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., and Kim does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 27 depends from claim 15, as presented. As more fully set forth above, the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer*, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented. Kim also does not disclose, or even suggest, this feature of claim 15, as presented, and thus, fails to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., and Kim does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15, from which claim 27 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., and Kim does not render unpatentable claim 27, which depends from claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., and Ishii et al., and further in view of Kim and U.S. Patent No. 6,341,769 ("Lin et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., Kim, and Lin et al. does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26 depends from claim 15, as presented. As more fully set forth above, the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., and Kim does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of *adjusting a mechanical stability of the at least one connecting point corresponding to the setpoint rupture joint via a thickness of the activatable layer*, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented. Lin et al. also do not disclose, or even suggest, this feature of claim 15, as presented, and thus, fail to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., Kim, and Lin et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15, from which claim 26 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Ueyanagi et al., Susukida et al., Bonin et al., Ishii et al., Kim, and Lin et al. does not render unpatentable claim 26, which depends from claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/ Reg. No. 42,194 for:
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646